	Case 1:22-cv-01580-JLT-SAB Documer	at 43 Filed 02/22/24 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	FREDERICK WAYNE SMITH,	No. 1:22-cv-01580-JLT-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
13	V.	FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
14	KATHLEEN ALLISON, et al.	(Doc. 42)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On February 8, 2024, the instant action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 was dismissed,	
18	without prejudice, for failure to exhaust the administrative remedies and judgment was entered.	
19	(Docs. 40, 41.) On February 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order.	
20	(Doc. 42.) Plaintiff contends that he needs an emergency transfer because inmates are trying to	
21	kill him. (<i>Id</i> . at 1.)	
22	A temporary restraining order is an extraordinary measure of relief that a federal court	
23	may impose without notice to the adverse party if, in an affidavit or verified complaint, the	
24	movant "clearly show[s] that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the	
25	movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(A). A	
26	plaintiff seeking injunctive relief "must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he	
27	is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities	
28	tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council,	
		1

Case 1:22-cv-01580-JLT-SAB Document 43 Filed 02/22/24 Page 2 of 2

Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008) (citations omitted); see also Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001) (stating that the analysis for temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions is "substantially identical").

Because the instant action has been dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to exhaust the administrative remedies, Plaintiff cannot show that he has any likelihood of success sufficient to warrant a temporary restraining order. In addition, the Court does not have jurisdiction over any parties in this action because the action is closed. *See Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 584 (1999) ("Personal jurisdiction, too, is an essential element of the jurisdiction of a district...court, without which the court is powerless to proceed to an adjudication.") (citation and internal quotation omitted). Accordingly, the Court ORDERS:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order is DENIED.
- 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to provide this order to Litigation Coordinator at Kern Valley State Prison via fax or email, so that if there are steps that need to be taken to protect Mr. Smith, that those actions are taken.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **February 21, 2024**

THE STATES DISTRICT JUDGE